Application Serial No.: 10/519,232
Amendment and Response dated August 16 2010
Reply to Office Action of June 11 2010
Page 9 of 11

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1-15, 18, 20, 23-29, 31-36 and 38-42 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1, 14, 18 and 38 have been amended. The amendment to claims 1, 18 and 38, now reciting "wherein said software for training the subject provides a plurality of stimuli that are not identical to stimuli received by the subject during performance of the task", is supported throughout the application, for example paragraphs 166, and Figure 10 and the accompanying description on paragraphs 218-248 in the application as published. Claim 14 has been amended to recite "wherein said mapping is performed ~~at least semi-~~automatically"; support may be found throughout the application, for example in the current claim 23 for example.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicant thanks Examiner Timothy A Musselman for the telephone Interview with Applicant's agent, D'vorah Graeser, on August 11 2010 in which the rejections of the claims in the Office Action of June 11 2010 were discussed. Proposed claim amendments and additional claims were discussed, particularly with regard to two specific amendment suggestions as described below. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his time and consideration.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15, 18, 21-22, 24-29, 36 and 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Bliss ("Communality of video game performance with tracking tasks"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

However, to expedite the prosecution, Applicant has chosen to amend the claims to include language indicated as being allowable by the Examiner over Bliss in the telephone Interview. The Examiner stated in the Interview that claim 23 was already

Application Serial No.: 10/519,232
Amendment and Response dated August 16 2010
Reply to Office Action of June 11 2010
Page 10 of 11

allowable as it recites "wherein said mapping is performed automatically"; claim 14 has been amended to recite this language as described above.

In the telephone Interview, the Examiner also indicated that allowable language would clearly indicate that the software of the trainer does not attempt to replicate the task to be trained; for example, if the task is basketball, allowable language would indicate that the software does not attempt to reproduce a basketball type game. Claims 1, 18 and 38 have been amended to recite "wherein said software for training the subject provides a plurality of stimuli that are not identical to stimuli received by the subject during performance of the task", thereby indicating that the software is not attempting to reproduce a basketball type game but instead provides different stimuli.

Applicant feels that as these cancelations and amendments now limit the claims to allowable subject matter as indicated by the Examiner, the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Application Serial No.: 10/519,232
Amendment and Response dated August 16 2010
Reply to Office Action of June 11 2010
Page 11 of 11

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview with the undersigned would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (301) 952-1011.

Respectfully submitted,

/D'vorah Graeser, Reg No 40,000/

Date: August 16 2010
Reg. No. 40,000
Tel. No. (301) 952-1011

D'vorah Graeser
Agent for Applicant
c/o Discovery Dispatch
9003 Florin Way
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772